

ON THE SECOND BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR A CLASS OF FULLY NONLINEAR FLOWS I

RONGLI HUANG

ABSTRACT. A class of fully nonlinear flows is considered with nonlinear Neumann type boundary conditions. This problem was solved partly by the author under the assumption that the flow is the parabolic type special Lagrangian equation. We can show that the convexity is preserved for solutions of the fully nonlinear parabolic equations and exhibit the long time existence and convergence of the flow. In particular, this shows that one can prescribe the boundary value problems for a family of minimal Lagrangian graphs in Euclidean and pseudo-Euclidean space.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper the long time existence and convergence of convex solutions solving

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = F(D^2u), \quad \text{in } \Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T),$$

associated with the second boundary value problem

$$(1.2) \quad Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, \quad t > 0,$$

and the initial condition

$$(1.3) \quad u = u_0, \quad t = 0,$$

for given F , u_0 , Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$ will be studied. Specifically, Ω , $\tilde{\Omega}$ are strict convex bounded domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. F is a $C^{2+\alpha}$ function for some $0 < \alpha < 1$ defined on the cone Γ_+ of positive definite symmetric matrices, which is monotone increasing and

$$(1.4) \quad F[A] := F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$$

with

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$$

being the eigenvalues of the $n \times n$ symmetric matrix A .

Our motivation for studying equations (1.1)-(1.3) comes from providing a parabolic approach to prescribe the boundary value problems for a family of minimal

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C44; Secondary 53A10.

Keywords and phrases. minimal Lagrangian graph; Gâteaux derivative; Hopf lemma.

Lagrangian graphs. In Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, Brendle-Warren' theorem [1] says that there exists a diffeomorphism $f: \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ such that the graph

$$\Sigma = \{(x, f(x)) | x \in \Omega\}$$

is a minimal Lagrangian submanifold. It's well known that Σ has zero mean curvature if and only if the Lagrangian angle is constant, a proof of which can be found in the literature (see Harvey and Lawson [2], Proposition 2.17). To find a minimal Lagrangian graph Σ with f being a diffeomorphism $\Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ is equivalent to the following problem ($f = \nabla u$):

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

Using the continued method of solving fully nonlinear elliptic equations with second boundary conditions, S. Brendle and M. Warren [1] obtained the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (1.5). By studying the parabolic type special Lagrangian equation with second boundary conditions:

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \sum_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i, & t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, & t > 0, \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

the author [3] proved the long time existence and convergence of the flow and then one can show the existence result of the minimal Lagrangian submanifolds with the same boundary conditions in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. In this paper we will see that there exists relative interesting geometric flow with second boundary conditions, where the stable solutions correspond to a family of minimal Lagrangian graphs in pseudo-Euclidean space. To obtain the long time existence and convergence of the flow it is often important to know whether the convexity of solutions of an evolution equation involved remain unchanged in time, seeing for example B.Andrews[4], P. L.Lions and M. Musiela[5].

Let δ_0 be the standard Euclidean metric and g_0 be the pseudo-Euclidean metric where

$$g_0 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i (dx_i \otimes dy_i + dy_i \otimes dx_i).$$

By taking linear combinations of the metrics δ_0 and g_0 , one can obtain a family of metrics on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$(1.7) \quad g_\tau = \cos \tau g_0 + \sin \tau \delta_0.$$

In calibrated geometry, we adapt the details of the extremal Lagrangian surfaces in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, g_\tau)$ which were firstly obtained by M. Warren [6] and arise as solutions to a family of special Lagrangian equations:

$$(1.8) \quad \text{For } \tau = 0, \quad \sum_i \ln \lambda_i = c$$

$$(1.9) \quad \text{For } \tau \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4}), \quad \sum_i \ln\left(\frac{\lambda_i + a - b}{\lambda_i + a + b}\right) = c$$

$$(1.10) \quad \text{For } \tau = \frac{\pi}{4}, \quad \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_i} = c$$

$$(1.11) \quad \text{For } \tau \in (\frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2}), \quad \sum_i \arctan\left(\frac{\lambda_i + a - b}{\lambda_i + a + b}\right) = c$$

$$(1.12) \quad \text{For } \tau = \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \sum_i \arctan \lambda_i = c$$

where $a = \cot \tau$ and $b = \sqrt{|\cot^2 \tau - 1|}$.

Here we consider the following fully nonlinear elliptic equations with second boundary conditions:

$$(1.13) \quad \begin{cases} F_\tau(D^2u) = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$F_\tau(A) = \begin{cases} \sum_i \ln \lambda_i, & \tau = 0, \\ \sum_i \ln\left(\frac{\lambda_i + a - b}{\lambda_i + a + b}\right) & 0 < \tau < \frac{\pi}{4}, \\ \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_i}, & \tau = \frac{\pi}{4}, \\ \sum_i \arctan\left(\frac{\lambda_i + a - b}{\lambda_i + a + b}\right), & \frac{\pi}{4} < \tau < \frac{\pi}{2}, \\ \sum_i \arctan \lambda_i, & \tau = \frac{\pi}{2}, \end{cases}$$

and ∇u is a Lagrangian minimal diffeomorphism from Ω to $\tilde{\Omega}$ in Euclidean and pseudo-Euclidean space. In dimension 2, P. Delanoë [7] obtained a unique smooth solution for the second boundary value problem of the Monge-Ampère equation according to $\tau = 0$ in (1.13) if both domains are uniformly convex. Later the generalization of P. Delanoë' theorem to higher dimensions was given by L. Caffarelli [8] and J. Urbas [9]. Using the parabolic methods, O.C. Schnurer and K. Smoczyk [10] also obtained the existence of solutions to (1.13) for $\tau = 0$. As far as $\tau = \frac{\pi}{2}$ is concerned, S. Brendle and M. Warren [1] proved the existence and uniqueness of the solution by the elliptic methods and the author [3] obtained the existence of solution by the parabolic methods.

The aim of the paper is to study the existence of solutions of the equations (1.13) for $\tau = \frac{\pi}{4}$, i.e.,

$$(1.14) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_i \frac{1}{1+\lambda_i} = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

We will see that $-F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ can be viewed as the map F defined by (1.4) which satisfies

$$(1.15) \quad F(A) \text{ and } F^*(A) \triangleq -F(A^{-1}) \text{ are concave on } \Gamma_+,$$

$$(1.16) \quad \Lambda \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \geq \lambda,$$

and

$$(1.17) \quad \Lambda \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \lambda_i^2 \geq \lambda,$$

for any $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ in the cone Γ_+ where Λ, λ are two positive constants.

The main results of this paper can be summarized as follows

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and the map F satisfies (1.4), (1.15), (1.16), (1.17). Then for any given initial function $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ which is strictly convex and satisfies $Du_0(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}$, the strictly convex solution of (1.1)-(1.3) exists for all $t \geq 0$ and $u(\cdot, t)$ converges to a function u^∞ in $C^{1+\zeta}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{3+\alpha}(\bar{D})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any $D \subset\subset \Omega$, $\zeta < 1$, and $u^\infty \in C^{1+1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{3+\alpha}(\Omega)$ is a solution of*

$$(1.18) \quad \begin{cases} F(D^2u) = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

The constant c depends only on $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ and Λ, λ . The solution to (1.18) is unique up to additions of constants.

Remark 1.2. *Elliptic regularity theory implies that if F is C^∞ , then $u^\infty \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$.*

Remark 1.3. *Theorem 3.3 of B.Andrews in [4] proved that it can preserve convexity for solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic equations under conditions (1.4) and (1.15) if the solutions on the boundary are convex. Here we do not make any assumption of u to be convex on the boundary.*

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we will prove the existence and uniqueness of classical solution of (1.14).

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exist $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and the constant c such that u is a solution of the second boundary value problem (1.14). The solution to (1.14) is unique up to additions of constants.*

By the above result, we can extend Brendle-Warren' theorem [1] to $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, g_{\frac{\pi}{4}})$:

Corollary 1.5. *Let $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a diffeomorphism $f: \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ such that the graph*

$$\Sigma = \{(x, f(x)) | x \in \Omega\}$$

is a minimal Lagrangian submanifold in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, g_{\frac{\pi}{4}})$.

The monotone increasing of F implies the ellipticity to the equation (1.18). Condition (1.15) is essentially the ones used in [4] to preserve the convexity for the solutions of the fully nonlinear parabolic equations, and conditions (1.16), (1.17) are essential part to carry out the upcoming C^2 priori estimates for the solutions on the boundary.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish the local existence result to the flow (1.1)-(1.3) by the inverse function theory. In Section 3, we collect necessary preliminaries which will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The techniques used in this section are reflective of those in [3], [9], and [10] to the second boundary value problems for fully nonlinear differential equations, and in the barrier arguments the structure conditions (1.16), (1.17) play an important role to construct suitable auxiliary functions for the C^2 upper estimates on the boundary. The conditions are also used to establish the C^2 lower bounds for the solutions on the boundary. In Section 4, we give the proof to Theorem 1.1. In Section 5, after we replace F by $-F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ in (1.1), under the flow (1.1)-(1.3) we can show that $-F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ satisfies the conditions (1.15), (1.16), (1.17) and then we can give the proof of Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5. In Section 6, we show that the applications of Theorem 1.1 include a number of previously established results of various authors as consequences.

2. THE SHORT-TIME EXISTENCE OF THE PARABOLIC FLOW

Throughout the following Einstein's convention of summation over repeated indices will be adopted. Denote

$$u_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, u_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}, u_{ijk} = \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_k}, \dots,$$

and

$$[u^{ij}] = [u_{ij}]^{-1}, \quad F^{ij}(D^2u) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_{ij}}, \quad \Omega_T = \Omega \times (0, T).$$

By the methods on the second boundary value problems for equations of Monge-Ampère type [9], the parabolic boundary condition in (1.2) can be reformulated as

$$h(Du) = 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0,$$

where h is a smooth function on $\tilde{\Omega}$:

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n | h(p) > 0\}, \quad |Dh|_{\partial\tilde{\Omega}} = 1.$$

The so called boundary defining function is strictly concave, i.e, $\exists \theta > 0$,

$$\frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \xi_i \xi_j \leq -\theta |\xi|^2, \quad \text{for } \forall y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in \tilde{\Omega}, \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We also give the boundary defining function according to Ω (cf.[1]):

$$\Omega = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n | \tilde{h}(p) > 0\}, \quad |D\tilde{h}|_{\partial\Omega} = 1,$$

$$\exists \tilde{\theta} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{h}}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} \xi_i \xi_j \leq -\tilde{\theta} |\xi|^2, \quad \text{for } \forall y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) \in \tilde{\Omega}, \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus the parabolic flow (1.1)-(1.3) is equivalent to the evolution problem:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = F(D^2 u), & t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ h(Du) = 0, & t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

To establish the short-time existence of classical solutions of (2.1) we use the inverse function theorem in Fréchet spaces and the theory of linear parabolic equations for oblique boundary conditions. The method is along the line of the proof according to the short-time existence of convex solutions on the second boundary value problem for Lagrangian mean curvature flow [3]. We include the details for the convenience of the readers.

Lemma 2.1. (See Theorem 2 in [11].) Let X and Y be Banach spaces. Denote

$$J : X \rightarrow Y$$

be continuous and Gâteaux-differentiable, with $J(v_0) = w_0$. Assume that the derivative $DJ[v]$ has a right inverse $L[v]$, uniformly bounded in a neighbourhood of v_0 :

$$\forall \alpha \in Y, \quad DJ[v]L[v]\alpha = \alpha$$

$$\|v - v_0\| \leq R \implies \|L[v] - L[v_0]\| \leq m.$$

For every $w \in Y$ if

$$\|w - w_0\| < \frac{R}{m}$$

then there is some $v \in X$ such that we have:

$$\|v - v_0\| < R,$$

and

$$J(v) = w.$$

Lemma 2.2. (See Theorem 8.8 and 8.9 in [12].) Assume that $f \in C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $T > 0$, and $G(x, p)$, $G_p(x, p)$ are in $C^{1+\alpha}(\Sigma)$ for any compact subset Σ of $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\inf_{\partial\Omega} \langle G_p, \nu \rangle > 0$ where ν is the inner normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. Let $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ be strictly convex and satisfies $G(x, Du_0) = 0$. Then there

exists $T_{max} > 0$ such that we can find an unique solution which is strictly convex in x variable in the class $C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})$ to the following equations

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \Delta u = f(x, t), & T > t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ G(x, Du) = 0, & T > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

According to the proof in [9], one can verify the oblique boundary condition.

Lemma 2.3. (See J. Urbas [9].)

$u \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ with $D^2u > 0 \implies \inf_{\partial\Omega} h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k > 0$ where $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n)$ is the unit inward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$, i.e, $h(Du) = 0$ is strictly oblique.

We are now in a position to prove the short-time existence of solutions of (2.1) which is equivalent to the problem (1.1)-(1.3).

Proposition 2.4. According to the conditions in Theorem 1.1, there exist some $T_{max} > 0$ and $u \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})$ which depend only on $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}, u_0$, such that u is a solution of (2.1) and is strictly convex in x variable.

Proof. Denote the Banach spaces

$$X = C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T), \quad Y = C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T) \times C^{1+\alpha, \frac{1+\alpha}{2}}(\partial\Omega \times (0, T)) \times C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}),$$

where

$$\|\cdot\|_Y = \|\cdot\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)} + \|\cdot\|_{C^{1+\alpha, \frac{1+\alpha}{2}}(\partial\Omega \times (0, T))} + \|\cdot\|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})}.$$

Define a map

$$J : X \rightarrow Y$$

by

$$J(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - F(D^2u), & (x, t) \in \Omega_T, \\ h(Du), & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times \{t = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

The strategy is now to use the inverse function theorem to obtain the local existence result. The computation of the Gâteaux derivative shows that:

$$\forall u, v \in X, \quad DJ[u](v) \triangleq \frac{d}{d\tau} J(u + \tau v)|_{\tau=0} = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} - F^{ij}(D^2u)v_{ij}, & (x, t) \in \Omega_T, \\ h_{p_i}(Du)v_i, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ v, & (x, t) \in \Omega \times \{t = 0\}. \end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 2.2 there exists $T_{max} > 0$ such that we can find $\hat{u} \in X$ to be strictly convex in x variable, which satisfies the following equations :

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial t} - \Delta \hat{u} = F(D^2u_0) - \Delta u_0, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ h(D\hat{u}) = 0, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \\ \hat{u} = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

For each $(f, g, w) \in Y$, using Lemma 2.2 again there exists an unique $v \in X$ satisfying $DJ[\hat{u}](v) = (f, g, w)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} - F^{ij}(D^2\hat{u})v_{ij} = f, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ h_{p_i}(D\hat{u})v_i = g, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \\ v = w, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then the derivative $DJ[\hat{u}]$ has a right inverse $L[\hat{u}]$ and for $T = T_{max}$ we see that

$$(2.3) \quad \forall \gamma = (f, g, w) \in Y, \quad DJ[\hat{u}]L[\hat{u}]\gamma = \gamma.$$

If set

$$\hat{f} = \frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial t} - F(D^2\hat{u}), \quad w_0 = (\hat{f}, 0, u_0), \quad w = (0, 0, u_0)$$

then one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f} - 0\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} &= \|\Delta\hat{u} - \Delta u_0 + F(D^2u_0) - F(D^2\hat{u})\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \\ &\leq \|\Delta\hat{u} - \Delta u_0\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} + \|F(D^2u_0) - F(D^2\hat{u})\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \\ &\leq C \|\hat{u} - u_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant depending only on the known data. We may apply (2.2) to conclude: $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists T_{max} > 0$ to be small enough such that

$$\|\hat{f} - 0\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \leq C \|\hat{u} - u_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} < \varepsilon.$$

Thus it's obtained

$$\|w - w_0\|_Y = \|0 - \hat{f}\|_{C^{\alpha, \frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} < \varepsilon.$$

Combining with (2.3) and using Lemma 2.1 it gives the desired results. $\square$

Remark 2.5. *By the strong maximum principle, the strictly convex solution to (2.1) is unique.*

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

In this section, the C^2 a priori bound is accomplished by making the second derivative estimates on the boundary for the solutions of fully nonlinear parabolic equations. This treatment is similar to the problems presented in [3], [9] and [10], but requires some modification to accommodate the more general situation. Specifically, the structure conditions (1.16) and (1.17) are needed in order to drive differential inequalities from barriers which can be used.

For the convenience, we set

$$\beta^k \triangleq \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial u_k} = h_{p_k}(Du)$$

and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By Proposition 2.4 and the regularity theory of parabolic equations, we may assume that u is a strictly convex solution of (1.1)-(1.3) in the class $C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T) \cap C^{4+\alpha, 2+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\Omega_T)$ for some $T = T_{max} > 0$.

In establishing the C^2 estimates, firstly we make use of the method to do the strict obliqueness estimates, a parabolic version of a result of J.Urbas [9] which was given in [10]. Returning to Lemma 2.3, we can get a uniform positive lower bound of the quantity $\inf_{\partial\Omega} h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k$ which does not depend on t under the structure conditions of F .

Lemma 3.1. *As long as the uniformly convex solution to (1.1)-(1.3) exists, the strict obliqueness estimates can be obtained by*

$$(3.1) \quad \langle \beta, \nu \rangle \geq \frac{1}{C_1} > 0,$$

where the constant C_1 is independent of t .

Proof. Let $(x_0, t_0) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, T]$ such that

$$\langle \beta, \nu \rangle(x_0, t_0) = h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k = \min_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} \langle \beta, \nu \rangle.$$

By the computation in [9] it gives

$$(3.2) \quad \langle \beta, \nu \rangle = \sqrt{u^{ij}\nu_i\nu_j h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl}}.$$

Further on, we may assume that $t_0 > 0$ and $\nu(x_0) = (0, 0, \dots, 1) \triangleq e_n$. As in the proof of Lemma 8.1 in [10], by the convexity of Ω and its smoothness, we extend ν smoothly to a tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ such that in matrix sense

$$(3.3) \quad D_k \nu_l \equiv \nu_{kl} \leq -\frac{1}{C} \delta_{kl}$$

for some positive constant C . Let

$$v = \langle \beta, \nu \rangle + h(Du).$$

By the above assumptions and the boundary condition, it's obtained

$$v(x_0, t_0) = \min_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} v = \min_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} \langle \beta, \nu \rangle.$$

In (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$(3.4) \quad 0 = v_r = h_{p_n p_k} u_{kr} + h_{p_k} v_{kr} + h_{p_k} u_{kr}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq n-1, \\ 0 \leq \dot{v}.$$

We assume that the following key estimate holds which will be proved later ,

$$(3.5) \quad v_n(x_0, t_0) \geq -C,$$

where C is a constant depending only on Ω , u_0 , h , ε_0 , $\tilde{h}$ and we will use the conditions of (1.4), (1.15), (1.16), (1.17). It's not hard to check that (3.5) can be rewritten as

$$(3.6) \quad h_{p_n p_k} u_{kn} + h_{p_k} \nu_{kn} + h_{p_k} u_{kn} \geq -C.$$

Multiplying (3.6) with h_{p_n} and (3.4) with h_{p_r} respectively, and summing up together we obtain:

$$(3.7) \quad h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl} \geq -C h_{p_n} - h_{p_k} h_{p_l} \nu_{kl} - h_{p_k} h_{p_n p_l} u_{kl}.$$

By the concavity of h , it is readily checked that

$$-h_{p_n p_n} \geq 0, \quad h_{p_k} u_{kr} = \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial x_r} = 0, \quad h_{p_k} u_{kn} = \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial x_n} \geq 0.$$

Substituting those into (3.7) and using (3.3) it yields

$$h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl} \geq -C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C} |Dh|^2 = -C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C}.$$

According to the above last term, we distinguish two cases in (x_0, t_0) .

Case (i).

$$-C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C} \leq 0.$$

Then

$$h_{p_k}(Du) \nu_k = h_{p_n} \geq \frac{1}{C^2}.$$

It shows that there is a uniform positive lower bound of the quantity $\min_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} h_{p_k}(Du) \nu_k$.

Case (ii).

$$-C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C} > 0.$$

Then we obtain a positive lower bound of $h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl}$. Introduce the Legendre transformation of u ,

$$y_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad u^*(y_1, \dots, y_n, t) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i} - u(x, t).$$

In terms of $y_1, \dots, y_n, u^*(y_1, \dots, y_n)$, one can easily check that

$$\frac{\partial^2 u^*}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} = \left[\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \right]^{-1}.$$

Then u^* satisfies

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial t} - F^*(D^2 u^*) = 0, & T > t > 0, \quad x \in \tilde{\Omega}, \\ \tilde{h}(Du^*) = 0, & T > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\tilde{\Omega}, \\ u^* = u_0^*, & t = 0, \quad x \in \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{h}$ is a smooth and strictly concave function on $\tilde{\Omega}$:

$$\Omega = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n | \tilde{h}(p) > 0\}, \quad |D\tilde{h}|_{\partial\tilde{\Omega}} = 1,$$

and u_0^* is the Legendre transformation of u_0 . Here F^* is defined by (1.15). Set

$$F^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = -F(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n), \quad \mu_i = \lambda_i^{-1} (i = 1, 2, \dots, n).$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F^*}{\partial \lambda_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i^2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_i}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2 \frac{\partial F^*}{\partial \lambda_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu_i}.$$

Then the structure conditions of F imply that F^* also satisfies (1.16) and (1.17).

We also define

$$\tilde{v} = \tilde{\beta}^k \tilde{\nu}_k + \tilde{h}(Du^*) = \langle \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\nu} \rangle + \tilde{h}(Du^*),$$

where

$$\tilde{\beta}^k \triangleq \frac{\partial \tilde{h}(Du^*)}{\partial u_k^*} = \tilde{h}_{p_k}(Du^*),$$

and $\tilde{\nu} = (\tilde{\nu}_1, \tilde{\nu}_2, \dots, \tilde{\nu}_n)$ is the inner unit normal vector of $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$. Using the same methods, under the assumption of

$$\tilde{v}_n(y_0, t_0) \geq -C,$$

we obtain the positive lower bounds of $\tilde{h}_{p_k} \tilde{h}_{p_l} u_{kl}^*$ or

$$h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k = \tilde{h}_{p_k}(Du^*)\tilde{\nu}_k(y_0) = \tilde{h}_{p_n} \geq \frac{1}{C^2}.$$

We notice that

$$\tilde{h}_{p_k} \tilde{h}_{p_l} u_{kl}^* = \nu_i \nu_j u^{ij}.$$

Then the claim follows from (3.2) by the positive lower bounds of $h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl}$ and $\tilde{h}_{p_k} \tilde{h}_{p_l} u_{kl}^*$.

It remains to prove the key estimate (3.5). We generalize the proof of Lemma 8.1 in [10] for the goal.

Define the linearized operator by

$$L = F^{ij} \partial_{ij} - \partial_t.$$

Since $D^2\tilde{h} \leq -\tilde{\theta}I$, we obtain

$$(3.9) \quad L\tilde{h} \leq -\tilde{\theta} \sum F^{ii}.$$

On the other hand,

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} Lv = & h_{p_k p_l p_m} \nu_k F^{ij} u_{li} u_{mj} + 2h_{p_k p_l} F^{ij} \nu_{kj} u_{li} + h_{p_k p_l} F^{ij} u_{lj} u_{ki} \\ & + h_{p_k p_l} \nu_k L u_l + h_{p_k} L \nu_k. \end{aligned}$$

By estimating the first term in the diagonal basis, one yields

$$|h_{p_k p_l p_m} \nu_k F^{ij} u_{li} u_{mj}| \leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \lambda_i^2 \leq C,$$

where we use the assumption of (1.17) and C is a constant depending only on $h, \Omega, \lambda, \Lambda$. On the second term, by Cauchy inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} |2h_{p_k p_l} F^{ij} \nu_{kj} u_{li}| &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \lambda_i = C \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i}} \sqrt{\frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i}} \lambda_i \\ &\leq C \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \lambda_i^2 \right) \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

For the same reason, we get

$$|h_{p_k p_l} F^{ij} u_{lj} u_{ki}| \leq C.$$

After the simple calculation it gives

$$L u_l = 0.$$

Obviously we have

$$|h_{p_k} L\nu_k| \leq C \sum F^{ii}.$$

So there exists a positive constant C such that

$$(3.11) \quad Lv \leq C \sum F^{ii}$$

Here we use the condition (1.16) and C depends only on $h, \Omega, \lambda, \Lambda$.

Denote a neighborhood of x_0 :

$$\Omega_\delta \triangleq \Omega \cap B_\delta(x_0)$$

where δ is a positive constant such that ν is well defined in Ω_δ . We consider

$$\Phi \triangleq v(x, t) - v(x_0, t_0) + C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x - x_0|^2$$

where C_0 and A are positive constants to be determined. On $\partial\Omega \times [0, T]$ it is clear that $\Phi \geq 0$. Since v is bounded, we can select A large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} & (v(x, t) - v(x_0, t_0) + C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x - x_0|^2)|_{(\Omega \cap \partial B_\delta(x_0)) \times [0, T]} \\ & \geq v(x, t) - v(x_0, t_0) + A\delta^2 \\ & \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using the strictly concavity of $\tilde{h}$ we have

$$\Delta(C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x - x_0|^2) \leq C(-C_0 \tilde{\theta} + 2A) \sum F^{ii}.$$

Then by choosing the constant $C_0 \gg A$, we can show that

$$\Delta(v(x, 0) - v(x_0, t_0) + C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x - x_0|^2) \leq 0.$$

It follows from the maximum principle:

$$\begin{aligned} & (v(x, 0) - v(x_0, t_0) + C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x - x_0|^2)|_{\Omega_\delta} \\ & \geq \min_{(\partial\Omega \cap B_\delta(x_0)) \cup (\Omega \cap \partial B_\delta(x_0))} (v(x, 0) - v(x_0, t_0) + C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x - x_0|^2) \\ & \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.9) with (3.11) and letting C_0 be large enough we obtain

$$L\Phi \leq (-C_0 \tilde{\theta} + C + 2A) \sum F^{ii} \leq 0.$$

From the above arguments one can verify that Φ satisfies

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} L\Phi \leq 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega_\delta \times [0, T], \\ \Phi \geq 0, & (x, t) \in (\partial\Omega_\delta \times [0, T] \cup (\Omega_\delta \times \{t = 0\}). \end{cases}$$

Using the maximum principle we can deduce that

$$\Phi \geq 0, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega_\delta \times [0, T].$$

Combining it with $\Phi(x_0, t_0) = 0$, we obtain $\langle \nabla \Phi, e_n \rangle|_{(x_0, t_0)} \geq 0$ which gives the desired estimate (3.5). Thus we complete the proof of the lemma. $\square$

It follows from (3.11) that we can state the following result which is similar to Proposition 2.6 in [1].

Lemma 3.2. Fix a smooth function $H : \Omega \times \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow R$ and define $\varphi(x, t) = H(x, Du(x, t))$. Then there holds

$$|L\varphi| \leq C \sum F^{ii}, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega_T,$$

where C is a positive constant depending on $h, H, \Omega, \lambda, \Lambda$.

We can now proceed to do the C^2 estimates. The procedure is similar to a priori estimate on the second boundary value problem for Lagrangian mean curvature flow [3]. The strategy is to bound the interior second derivative firstly.

Lemma 3.3. For each $t \in [0, T]$, the following estimates hold:

$$(3.13) \quad \sup_{\Omega} |D^2 u| \leq \max_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} |D^2 u| + \max_{\Omega} |D^2 u_0|.$$

Proof. Given any unit vector ξ , by the concavity of F , $u_{\xi\xi}$ satisfies

$$\partial_t u_{\xi\xi} - F^{ij} \partial_{ij} u_{\xi\xi} = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_{ij} \partial u_{kl}} u_{ij\xi} u_{kl\xi} \leq 0.$$

Combining with the convexity of u and using the maximum principle we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq |u_{\xi\xi}| = u_{\xi\xi}(x, t) &\leq \max_{\partial\Omega_T} u_{\xi\xi} \\ &\leq \max_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} |D^2 u| + \max_{\Omega} |D^2 u_0|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the estimates (3.13) are satisfied. $\square$

By tangentially differentiating the boundary condition $h(Du) = 0$ we have some second order derivative bounds on $\partial\Omega$, i.e.,

$$(3.14) \quad u_{\beta\tau} = h_{p_k}(Du) u_{k\tau} = 0.$$

where τ denotes a tangential vector. The second order derivative estimates on the boundary are controlled by $u_{\beta\tau}, u_{\beta\beta}, u_{\tau\tau}$.

In the following we give the arguments as in [9] which can be found in [3]. For $x \in \partial\Omega$, any unit vector ξ can be written in terms of a tangential component $\tau(\xi)$ and a component in the direction β by

$$\xi = \tau(\xi) + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \beta,$$

where

$$\tau(\xi) = \xi - \langle \nu, \xi \rangle \nu - \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \beta^T$$

and

$$\beta^T = \beta - \langle \beta, \nu \rangle \nu.$$

After a simple computation it yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(\xi)|^2 &= 1 - (1 - \frac{|\beta^T|^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2}) \langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2 - 2 \langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \\ (3.15) \quad &\leq 1 + C \langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2 - 2 \langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \\ &\leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where we use the strict obliqueness estimates (3.1). Let $\tau \triangleq \frac{\tau(\xi)}{|\tau(\xi)|}$. Then by (3.14) and (3.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.16) \quad u_{\xi\xi} &= |\tau(\xi)|^2 u_{\tau\tau} + 2|\tau(\xi)| \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} u_{\beta\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \\
&= |\tau(\xi)|^2 u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \\
&\leq C(u_{\tau\tau} + u_{\beta\beta}).
\end{aligned}$$

Along with specifying the boundary conditions we can carry out the double derivative estimates in the direction β .

Lemma 3.4. *For each $t \in [0, T]$, we have the estimates*

$$\max_{\partial\Omega} u_{\beta\beta} \leq C_2$$

where $C_2 > 0$ depending only on $u_0, h, \tilde{h}, \Omega, \lambda, \Lambda$.

Proof. We use the barrier functions for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and thus consider

$$\Psi \triangleq \pm h(Du) + C_0 \tilde{h} + A|x - x_0|^2.$$

As the proof of (3.12), we can find the constant C_0 and A , such that we have

$$\begin{cases} L\Psi \leq 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega_\delta \times [0, T], \\ \Psi \geq 0, & (x, t) \in (\partial\Omega_\delta \times [0, T] \cup (\Omega_\delta \times \{t = 0\}). \end{cases}$$

By the maximum principle we get

$$\Psi \geq 0, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega_\delta \times [0, T].$$

Combining it with $\Psi(x_0, t_0) = 0$ and using Lemma 3.1 we obtain $\Psi_\beta(x_0, t_0) \geq 0$. Furthermore we see from $\beta = (\frac{\partial h}{\partial p_1}, \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_2}, \dots, \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_n})$ that

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \beta} = \langle Dh(Du), \beta \rangle = \Sigma_{k,l} \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_k} u_{kl} \beta^l = \Sigma_{k,l} \beta^k u_{kl} \beta^l = u_{\beta\beta}.$$

Then it shows that

$$|u_{\beta\beta}| = \left| \frac{\partial h}{\partial \beta} \right| \leq C_2.$$

□

We are now in a position to obtain the bound of double tangential derivative at the boundary.

Lemma 3.5. *There exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ depending only on $u_0, h, \tilde{h}, \Omega, \lambda, \Lambda$, such that*

$$\max_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} \max_{|\tau|=1, \langle \tau, \nu \rangle=0} u_{\tau\tau} \leq C_3.$$

Proof. Assume that $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 \in [0, T]$ and $\nu(x_0) = e_n$ to be the inner unit normal of $\partial\Omega$ at x_0 . Such that

$$\max_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} \max_{|\tau|=1, \langle \tau, \nu \rangle = 0} u_{\tau\tau} = u_{11}(x_0, t_0).$$

For any $x \in \partial\Omega$, combining (3.15) with (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\xi\xi} &= |\tau(\xi)|^2 u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \\ &\leq (1 + C\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2 - 2\langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle}) u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \\ &\leq (1 + C\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2 - 2\langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle}) u_{11}(x_0, t_0) + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $u_{11}(x_0, t_0) \geq 1$, then by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.4 we get

$$\frac{u_{\xi\xi}}{u_{11}(x_0, t_0)} + 2\langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \leq 1 + C\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2$$

Let $\xi = e_1$, then we have

$$\frac{u_{11}}{u_{11}(x_0, t_0)} + 2\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1 \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \leq 1 + C\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle^2$$

We see that the function

$$w \triangleq A|x - x_0|^2 - \frac{u_{11}}{u_{11}(x_0, t_0)} - 2\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1 \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} + C\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle^2 + 1$$

satisfies

$$w|_{\partial\Omega \times [0, T]} \geq 0, \quad w(x_0, t_0) = 0.$$

As before, by (3.13) we can select the constant A such that

$$w|_{(\partial B_\delta(x_0) \cap \Omega) \times [0, T]} \geq 0.$$

Consider

$$-2\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1 \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} + C\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle^2 + 1$$

as a known function depending on x and Du . Then by Lemma 3.2 we obtain

$$|L(-2\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1 \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} + C\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle^2 + 1)| \leq C \sum F^{ii}.$$

Combining it with the proof of Lemma 3.3 we have

$$Lw \leq C \sum F^{ii}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we consider the function

$$\Upsilon \triangleq w + C_0 \tilde{h}.$$

A standard barrier argument shows that

$$\Upsilon_\beta(x_0, t_0) \geq 0.$$

A direct computation yields

$$(3.17) \quad u_{11\beta} \leq Cu_{11}(x_0, t_0).$$

On the other hand, differentiating $h(Du)$ twice in the direction e_1 at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$h_{p_k}u_{k11} + h_{p_k p_l}u_{k1}u_{l1} = 0.$$

The concavity of h yields

$$h_{p_k}u_{k11} = -h_{p_k p_l}u_{k1}u_{l1} \geq \tilde{C}u_{11}(x_0, t_0)^2.$$

Combining it with $h_{p_k}u_{k11} = u_{11\beta}$, and using (3.17) we obtain

$$\tilde{C}u_{11}(x_0, t_0)^2 \leq Cu_{11}(x_0, t_0)$$

Then we get the upper bound of $u_{11}(x_0, t_0)$ and the conclusion follows. $\square$

Using Lemma 3.4, 3.5, and (3.16), we obtain the C^2 a priori bound on the boundary:

Lemma 3.6. *There exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ depending on $h, \tilde{h}, u_0, \lambda, \Lambda$, and Ω , such that*

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega_T} |D^2u| \leq C_4.$$

Combining Lemma 3.3 with Lemma 3.6, the following result is thus proven:

Lemma 3.7. *There exists a constant $C_5 > 0$ depending on $h, \tilde{h}, u_0, \Omega, \lambda, \Lambda$ such that*

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}_T, |\xi|=1} D_{ij}u\xi_i\xi_j \leq C_5.$$

By the Legendre transformation of u , using (3.8) and repeating the proof of the above lemmas we get the following statement:

Lemma 3.8. *There exists a constant $C_6 > 0$ depending on $h, \Omega, \tilde{h}, \tilde{\Omega}, u_0, \lambda, \Lambda$ such that*

$$(3.18) \quad \frac{1}{C_6} \leq \inf_{\bar{\Omega}_T, |\xi|=1} D_{ij}u\xi_i\xi_j \leq \sup_{\bar{\Omega}_T, |\xi|=1} D_{ij}u\xi_i\xi_j \leq C_6.$$

Remark 3.9. *The conditions (1.16) and (1.17) pledge the differential inequality (3.11) holds which play a central role in the C^2 estimates on the boundary. If the other operator F has the property (3.11) and satisfies (1.4), (1.15), then the above lemmas also hold.*

4. LONGTIME EXISTENCE AND CONVERGENCE

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Now let u_0 be a $C^{2+\alpha}$ strictly convex function as in the conditions of Theorem 1.1. Combining Proposition 2.4 with Lemma 3.8, $\forall T > 0$, $\exists u \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)$ which satisfies (1.1) and (3.18). Using the boundary condition, we have

$$(4.1) \quad |Du| \leq C_7$$

where C_7 be a constant depending on Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$. By Schauder estimates for parabolic equations (cf. Lemma 14.6 in [12]), for any $\hat{\Omega} \subset\subset \Omega$, we have

$$\sup_{x_i \in \hat{\Omega}, t_i \geq 1} \frac{|D^{2+1}u(x_1, t_1) - D^{2+1}u(x_2, t_2)|}{\max\{|x_1 - x_2|^\alpha, |t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\}} \leq C \sup |D^2u| \leq C_8$$

where C_8 is a constant depending on the known data and $\text{dist}(\partial\Omega, \hat{\Omega})$. By *Arzelà – Ascoli* theorem, a diagonal sequence argument shows that for any $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ satisfying

$$\lim t_k = +\infty,$$

there exist a subsequence

$$\{t_{k_j}\}_{j=1}^{+\infty} \subset \{t_k\}_{k=1}^{+\infty}$$

and

$$\hat{u} \in C^{1+1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{3+\alpha}(\Omega).$$

Such that for any $\zeta < 1$ and $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(\cdot, t_{k_j}) - \hat{u}(\cdot)\|_{C^{1+\zeta}(\bar{\Omega})} = 0.$$

$$(4.2) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} D^{3+\alpha}u(x, t_{k_j}) = D^{3+\alpha}\hat{u}(x),$$

and $\hat{u}$ satisfies (3.18). Then we get

$$h(D\hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} F(D^2u(x, t_{k_j})) = F(D^2\hat{u}(x)), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

For each l , differentiating the equation (1.1) by x_l yields

$$\partial_t u_l = F^{ij} \partial_{ij} u_l.$$

Integrating from 0 to t on both sides we obtain

$$u_l(x, t) - u_l(x, 0) = \int_0^t F^{ij} \partial_{ij} u_l(x, \sigma) d\sigma.$$

Combining it with (4.1), (4.2), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} F^{ij} \partial_{ij} u_l(x, t) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Using this fact along with (4.2), the following equation emerges:

$$F^{ij} \partial_{ij} \hat{u}_l = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad l \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Specifically, it is claimed that

$$F(D^2\hat{u}) = C_9, \quad x \in \Omega$$

for some constant C_9 . By the same methods known from [1], the solution to (1.18) is unique up to additions of constants. So the constant C_9 is independent of u_0 . Then the claim of Theorem 1.1 follows from the above arguments. $\square$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4 AND COROLLARY 1.5

Let

$$(5.1) \quad F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) := -F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = -\sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_i}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is based on the following conclusions.

Lemma 5.1.

F and F^* are concave on the cone Γ_+ .

Proof. We calculate directly:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} \xi_i \xi_j &= -2 \sum \frac{\xi_i^2}{(1 + \lambda_i)^3} \leq 0, \\ \sum \frac{\partial^2 F^*}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} \xi_i \xi_j &= -2 \sum \frac{\xi_i^2}{(1 + \lambda_i)^3} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the above inequalities imply the desired result. $\square$

Lemma 5.2 ($\dot{u}$ -estimates).

As long as the convex solution to (1.1)-(1.3) exists, the following estimates hold, i.e.

$$\Theta_0 \triangleq \min_{\Omega} F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}(D^2 u_0) \leq -\dot{u} \triangleq -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \leq \Theta_1 \triangleq \max_{\Omega} F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}(D^2 u_0).$$

Proof. We use the methods known from Lemma 2.1 in [10].

From (1.1), a direct computation shows that

$$\frac{\partial(-\dot{u})}{\partial t} - F^{ij} \partial_{ij}(-\dot{u}) = 0.$$

Using the maximum principle we see that

$$\min_{\Omega_T}(-\dot{u}) = \min_{\partial\Omega_T}(-\dot{u}).$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $-\dot{u} \neq \text{constant}$. If $\exists x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0$, such that $-\dot{u}(x, t) = \min_{\bar{\Omega}_T}(-\dot{u})$. Then we differentiate the boundary condition and obtain

$$-\dot{u}_\beta = -\frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial t} = 0.$$

Since $\langle \beta, \nu \rangle > 0$, it contradicts the Hopf Lemma (cf.[13]) for parabolic equations. So that

$$-\dot{u} \geq \min_{\Omega_T}(-\dot{u}) = \min_{\partial\Omega_T|_{t=0}}(-\dot{u}) = \min_{\Omega} F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}(D^2 u_0).$$

For the same reason, we have

$$-\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \leq \Theta_1 \triangleq \max_{\bar{\Omega}} F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}(D^2 u_0).$$

Putting these facts together, the assertion follows. $\square$

Since $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ and is strictly convex, it is clear that $0 < \Theta_0 \leq \Theta_1 < n$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let (x, t) be arbitrary point of Ω_T , and $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $D^2 u$ at (x, t) . As long as the convex solution to (1.1)-(1.3) exists, then*

$$(5.2) \quad 0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \frac{n}{\Theta_0} - 1, \quad \frac{n}{\Theta_1} - 1 \leq \lambda_n.$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of $F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}(D^2 u)$ and Lemma 5.2:

$$\Theta_0 \leq -\dot{u} = \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_i} \leq \frac{n}{1 + \lambda_1}.$$

Combining with the convexity of u we obtain

$$1 \leq 1 + \lambda_1 \leq \frac{n}{\Theta_0}.$$

Using the same methods, we get

$$\frac{n}{1 + \lambda_n} \leq -\dot{u} = \sum_i \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_i} \leq \Theta_1.$$

Then we have

$$\frac{n}{\Theta_1} \leq 1 + \lambda_n.$$

The above arguments prove the claim. $\square$

Now we can show the operator $-F_{\frac{\pi}{4}}$ satisfying (1.16) and (1.17) which play an important role in the barrier arguments.

Corollary 5.4. *As long as the convex solution to (1.1)-(1.3) exists, then for any $(x, t) \in \Omega_T$ we have*

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{\Theta_0^2}{n^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \leq n,$$

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{(n - \Theta_1)^2}{n^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} \lambda_i^2 \leq n,$$

Proof. We observe

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial F}{\partial \lambda_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_i)^2}.$$

By Lemma 5.3 and the convexity of u , we have

$$\frac{\Theta_0^2}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_1)^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda_i)^2} \leq n.$$

We further obtain

$$\frac{(n - \Theta_1)^2}{n^2} \leq \frac{\lambda_n^2}{(1 + \lambda_n)^2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i^2}{(1 + \lambda_i)^2} \leq n.$$

Corollary 5.4 is established. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.4:

It follows from Lemma 5.1, Corollary 5.4 and Theorem 1.1 . $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.5:

Let u be a convex solution of (1.14) and define $f = \nabla u$, then f is a diffeomorphism from Ω to $\tilde{\Omega}$. It follows from [6] that the graph

$$\Sigma = \{(x, f(x)) | x \in \Omega\}$$

is a minimal Lagrangian submanifold in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, g_{\frac{\pi}{4}})$. The required properties are thus proved. $\square$

6. APPLICATIONS TO MINIMAL LAGRANGIAN DIFFEOMORPHISM PROBLEMS

Let

$$F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) := F_{\frac{\pi}{2}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) = \sum_i \arctan \lambda_i.$$

A direct computation shows that F and F^* are concave on the cone Γ_+ . Using Corollary 3.3 in [3] we see that F satisfies (1.16) and (1.17). By Theorem 1.1, we reproved the existence result on the second boundary value problem for special Lagrangian equations which belongs to S.Brendle and M.Warren.

Theorem 6.1. *(see Theorem 1.1 in [1]) Let $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exist $u \in C^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})$ and the constant c which satisfy*

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{cases} \sum_i \arctan \lambda_i = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, \end{cases}$$

where the solution is unique up to additions of constants.

By [1] and [6], we present the similar minimal Lagrangian diffeomorphism problem in the following. The two convex domains $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary are fixed. Given a diffeomorphism $f : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$, the graph $\Sigma = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in \Omega\} \subset \mathbb{R}_n^{2n}$ is considered.

Question: How to find a diffeomorphism $f : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ such that Σ is Lagrangian and has zero mean curvature in $\mathbb{R}_n^{2n}$. By [14], the graph Σ is Lagrangian if and only if there is a convex potential function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f = \nabla u$, and the graph Σ has zero mean curvature in $\mathbb{R}_n^{2n}$ if and only if there exists some constant c such that

$$\ln \det D^2 u = c.$$

Hence, we present the problem as

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{cases} \ln \det D^2 u = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

In 1997, J.Urbas proved the existence and uniqueness of globally smooth convex solutions to (6.2), i.e.,

Theorem 6.2. *(see Theorem 1.1 in [9]) Let $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exist $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and the constant c which satisfy (6.2) where the solution is unique up to additions of constants.*

Later, O.C. Schnurer and K. Smoczyk also obtained the above result by parabolic methods [10]. In fact, we can consider Lagrangian mean curvature flow in pseudo-Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}_n^{2n}$ (cf.[15]) with boundary conditions:

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \ln \det D^2 u, & t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, & t > 0, \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) := F_\tau(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)|_{\tau=0} = \sum_i \ln \lambda_i.$$

A direct computation yields that F and F^* are concave on the cone Γ_+ . Here we need modify v slightly which occur in Lemma 3.1 to

$$v = \langle \beta, \nu \rangle + Ah(Du)$$

which was introduced by J.Urbas [9]. Using the computation of Lemma 8.1 in [10], we have

$$Lv \leq C \sum F^{ii}$$

where $L \triangleq F^{ij} \partial_{ij} - \partial_t$ as before. By remark 3.9, we also obtain Theorem 6.2 as a corollary of Theorem 1.1.

In summary, by Theorem 1.1, we obtain the existence and uniqueness of globally smooth convex solutions to (1.13), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} F_\tau(D^2 u) = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, \end{cases}$$

for $\tau = 0, \frac{\pi}{4}$, or $\frac{\pi}{2}$. Finally, we give another version of the above results as following

Theorem 6.3. *Let $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a smooth diffeomorphism $f_\tau: \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ such that the graph*

$$\Sigma = \{(x, f(x)) | x \in \Omega\}$$

is a minimal Lagrangian submanifold in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n, g_\tau)$ for $\tau = 0, \frac{\pi}{4}$, or $\frac{\pi}{2}$.

Acknowledgment: The author was supported by NNSF of China (Grant No. 11261008).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Brendle, M. Warren, *A boundary value problem for minimal Lagrangian graphs*, J. Differential Geom. **84**(2010), 267-287.
- [2] R. Harvey, H.B. Lawson , *Calibrated geometry*. Acta Math. 148(1982),47-157.
- [3] R.L. Huang, *On the second boundary value problem for Lagrangian mean curvature flow*, J. Funct. Anal. **269** (2015),1095-1114.
- [4] B. Andrews, *Pinching estimates and motions of hypersurfaces by curvature functions*, J. Rein. Angew. Math. **608** (2007), 17-33.
- [5] Lions, P. L. and Musiela, M., *Convexity of solutions of parabolic equations*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, **342**(2003), 915C921.
- [6] M. Warren, *Calibrations associated to Monge-Ampère equations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362**(2010), 3947-3962.
- [7] P. Delanoe, *Classical solvability in dimension two of the second boundary-value problem associated with the Monge-Ampère operator*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire. **8** (1991), 443-457.
- [8] L. Caffarelli, *Boundary regularity of maps with convex potentials*, II, Ann. of Math. Stud. **144**(1996), 453-496.
- [9] J. Urbas, *On the second boundary value problems for equations of Monge-Ampère type*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **487** (1997), 115-124.
- [10] O.C. Schnuere, K. Smoczyk, *Neumann and second boundary value problems for Hessian and Gauss curvature flows*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire. **20** (2003), 1043-1073.
- [11] I. Ekeland, *An inverse function theorem in Fréchet spaces*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire. **28** (2011), 91-105.
- [12] G.M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations*, World Scientific, (1996).
- [13] Y.Y. Li, L.Nirenberg, *On the Hopf Lemma*, arXiv:0709.3531V1, 2007.
- [14] Y.L. Xin, *Minimal submanifolds and related topics*, World Scientific , (2003).
- [15] R.L. Huang, *Lagrangian mean Curvature flow In pseudo-Euclidean Space*, Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B **32**(2011), 187-200.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, GUANGXI NORMAL UNIVERSITY, GUILIN, GUANGXI 541004, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, E-MAIL: RONGLIHUANGMATH@GXNU.EDU.CN